

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

				•	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/960,606	09/21/2001	Barry L. Rauworth	2267.398US03	6639	
7590 02/25/2004			EXAMINER		
Patterson, The 4800 IDS Cent	uente, Skaar & Christ	CASTELLANO, STEPHEN J			
80 South 8th S		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Minneapolis, I	MN 55402-2100	3727	24		
			DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		Appli	cation No.	Applicant(s)				
. Office Action Summary		09/96	60,606	RAUWORTH ET	AL.			
		Exam	iner	Art Unit				
			en J. Castellano	3727				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
THE MA - Extension after SIX - If the per - If NO per - Failure to	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F ALLING DATE OF THIS COMMUN and of time may be available under the provisions (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common riod for reply specified above is less than thirty (3) riod for reply is specified above, the maximum storeply within the set or extended period for reply by received by the Office later than three months a reatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In a nunication. 0) days, a reply within the atutory period will apply a will, by statute, cause th	no event, however, may a reply e statutory minimum of thirty (3) and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS e application to become ABANI	be timely filed D) days will be considered timels from the mailing date of this conditions DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)⊠ R	esponsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>02 Februar</i> y	, 2004.					
·		2b)☐ This action						
·	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
cl	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition	of Claims							
4a 5)☐ Cl 6)⊠ Cl 7)☐ Cl	aim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the a) Of the above claim(s) <u>16</u> is/are w aim(s) is/are allowed. aim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected. aim(s) is/are objected to. aim(s) <u>16</u> are subject to restriction	rithdrawn from co						
Application	Papers							
10)∐ Th Ap Re	e specification is objected to by the drawing(s) filed on is/are: oplicant may not request that any objected to a continuous sheet(s) including e oath or declaration is objected to	a) accepted continuous accepted of accepted of accepted of accepted the correction is resulted.	(s) be held in abeyance. quired if the drawing(s)	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CF	` '			
Priority und	ier 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a) <u>□</u> 1. 2. 3.	knowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority Certified copies of the priority Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation the attached detailed Office action	documents have documents have of the priority doc nal Bureau (PCT	been received. been received in Appl uments have been rec Rule 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s)								
	f References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Sum	mary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice o	f Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F		Paper No(s)/M	ail Date	2.450)			
	ion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or o(s)/Mail Date	PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	mal Patent Application (PTC	J-1 52)			

Art Unit: 3727

Newly submitted claim 16 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Claim 16 is directed to a combination of stackable drums.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 16 has been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the stackable drums of claim 16 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim 16 is objected to because there is no drawing representation of the stackable drums.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed

Art Unit: 3727

invention. The application doesn't have support for "a single blow molding operation." For claim 16, there is no support for stackable drums. This is a new matter rejection.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6, 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKenzie in view of Przytulla ('049)(Przytulla) and Hammes ('122)(Hammes).

McKenzie discloses a plastic molded drum having a bung opening, the drum comprising a side wall, top structure and bottom structure, all integrally molded; the top structure comprising a chime (sleeve 12) having a top edge extending circumferentially around and radially outward with respect to the top wall, the chime is integrally molded in a separate operation than the top wall and side wall, there are no welded portions connecting the chime with the top wall or the side wall, and there are no welded portions connecting the top wall and the side wall, wherein the distance from the top of the first fitting to the top edge of the chime is sufficient such that components extending 1 ¼ inches above the top of the first fitting is (are) below the top edge of the chime (see total height of 20 inches and volume of 55 liters in column 5, lines 45-46). A container of this height with the height of the chime as drawn in relation to the height of the top of the first fitting appears to be at least 1 ¼ inches higher.

McKenzie discloses the invention except for the cylindrical side wall and a one-piece integrally molded structure molded in a single blow molding operation. Przytulla and Hammes both teach a cylindrical side wall and a one-piece integrally molded structure molded in a single

Art Unit: 3727

blow molding operation. It would have been obvious to modify the shape of the side wall to be cylindrical as a matter of design choice in sacrificing the packing efficiency of rectangular in cross section side walls for cylindrical side walls which have less corner surfaces on their interior allowing faster and easier cleaning. It would have been obvious to blow mold the structure into one-piece in a single operation as a matter of design choice to take advantage of a design requiring no assembly of separate parts and a design which can be manufactured in a single operation eliminating multiple stages of manufacturing requiring storage, part inventories and multiple machines to perform each stage of manufacturing.

In the event that the rejection is not sustained due to a lack of disclosure of a 1 1/4 inch height difference between the top edge of the chime and the top of the first fitting, it would have to modify this height by engineering design choice as an increase in chime height creates greater overlap with the bottom of a drum stacked directly thereabove as motivated by an increase in the stability of the stack.

Re claim 3, Przytulla and Hammes teach a bottom chime. It would have been obvious to add a bottom chime to prevent damage to the bottom structure and to avoid ruptures and spills due to this damage.

Note that: The admitted prior art in this application includes Fig. 1, 3-6 and any portions of the written specification which refer to these figures.

Claims 4, 5, 8, 9 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKenzie in view of Przytulla and Hammes as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of the admitted prior art within this application (the admitted prior art).

For claims 4, 5, 9 and 14, McKenzie discloses a closure 29. The combination discloses the invention except for the closure having a vent outlet and a vent valve and a cover extending over the vent outlet and valve. Admitted prior art as shown in Fig. 5 teaches a venting closure 100 having a vent outlet 106 and a vent valve 104 and a cover 108. It would have been obvious to replace the closure of McKenzie with the closure 100 and cover 108 as motivated by the need for a closure with pressure relieving capability so that damage or an explosion doesn't occur due to excessive pressure.

For claims 8 and 11-15, McKenzie discloses a closure 29 but lacks a showing of a drum insert and closure. The combination discloses the invention except for the drum insert and a closure attached to the drum insert. Admitted prior art as shown in Fig. 1, 3 and 4 teach a drum insert 54 having components 56, 78, 85, 86, 87, 89 and 98 and a related closure 60 having components 88, 90, 92 and 94. It would have been obvious to replace the closure of McKenzie with the drum insert and closure as motivated by the need to attach a multiple port bung connector allowing the contents of the drum to be suctioned or siphoned from the interior through tube 56 in an upright configuration without having to insert a tube or add another fitting with a tube and then detach the tube or fitting upon completion of the discharge process as motivated by the time savings accomplished therein.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground

Art Unit: 3727

provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-15 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-18 of U. S. Patent No. 6,045,000 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: A plastic molded drum having a bung opening, the plastic molded drum comprising a cylindrical wall, a top structure, and a bottom structure, all integrally molded.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Applicant's arguments filed February 2, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Przytulla '049 teaches a protective chime. Even though the chime is characterized as a carrying and transporting ring, the ring and the attachment structure absorb detrimental bending forces on the ring owing to the weight of stacked drums (see column 2, lines 15-19 and 35-42).

The terminal disclaimer filed on February 9, 2004 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term of prior US Patent No. 6,045,000 has been reviewed and is NOT accepted.

Art Unit: 3727

The person who signed the terminal disclaimer is not recognized as an officer of the assignee, and he/she has not been established as being authorized to act on behalf of the assignee. See MPEP § 324.

An attorney or agent, not of record, is not authorized to sign a terminal disclaimer in the capacity as an attorney or agent acting in a representative capacity as provided by 37 CFR 1.34 (a). See 37 CFR 1.321(b) and/or (c).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen J. Castellano whose telephone number is 703-308-1035. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 6:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lee W. Young can be reached on 703-308-2572. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9303 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3727

Page 8

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

Stephen J. Castellano Primary Examiner Art Unit 3727

sjc